

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:24-cv-129
-v-)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
SEAN "P.DIDDY" COMBS, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

This lawsuit is one of hundreds of frivolous legal actions filed by Ronald Emrit over the last ten years. Because Plaintiff was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the complaint and issued a Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6). The Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff has no ties whatsoever to this venue, and that he filed identical complaints in at least four other district courts. Incorporating by reference the order issued by the Eastern District of Pennsylvania addressing the exact same complaint, the Magistrate Judge recommends dismissing the lawsuit as frivolous and further recommends imposing a filing restriction on Plaintiff.

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a

de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam).

Plaintiff did not timely file any objections. After the deadline for filing objections expired, Plaintiff filed a document titled “Notice of Appeal” (ECF No. 7). He contends that this Court erred by dismissing his lawsuit as frivolous. Plaintiff requests the Court send the lawsuit to the First Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Court interprets Plaintiff’s latest submission as his objection to the Report and Recommendation. The Report and Recommendation was not a final order or judgment that would be subject to an appeal. The Court overrules the objection. Plaintiff’s objections do not contain the necessary specificity to challenge the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff has not identified any authority by which this Court would send this lawsuit to the First Circuit. Plaintiff address the recommendation that the Court impose a filing restriction on him.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6). The Court **DISMISSES** this lawsuit as frivolous. The Court has again reviewed the complaint and finds that any appeal would not be taken in good faith.

Consistent with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the Court places Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit on restricted filer status. In order to file a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Mr. Satish must either pay the full filing fee. Alternatively, Mr. Satish may request leave to proceed in forma pauperis and must provide, with the complaint, a certification from an attorney in good standing in this district that (1) the claims in the complaint are not frivolous, (2) the lawsuit is not brought for an improper purpose, and (3) the action is being filed in the correct venue.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 14, 2024

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge